

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 11, 2006, has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the present application has been amended in a manner which is believed to place it into consideration for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding Office Action and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully solicited in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Oswald* (U.S.P. No. 4,572,311). Claims 1-3, 6, 10, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Song* (U.S. Application Publication No. 2002/0153184) in view of *Oswald*. Claim 12 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Oswald* in view of *Zollinger* (U.S.P. No. 5,819,863). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Oswald* in view of *Turbowitz, et al.* (U.S.P. No. 4,540,376).

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present Amendment renders moot the above grounds of rejection by amending claim 1 to include allowable subject matter from claim 4. The invention defined by amended claim 1 differs from that of *Oswald et al* in the following respects. The present invention is directed to a driving device of a robot cleaner, whereas the applied reference is not. The shock-absorbing unit recited in amended claim 1 is different from, and not taught or suggested by, the hydraulic cylinder of the applied reference. The hydraulic cylinder of the applied reference is risky because of the use of high-pressure fluid and has a complex structure, whereas the shock-absorbing unit of the present claimed invention is simple and safe.

Since the applied *Song et al* reference does not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of *Oswald et al*, the proposed combination of references would not have resulted in, taught, or

suggested the present claimed invention. Also, because *Oswald et al* is non-analogous prior art, it would not have been obvious to combine the two references.

Similarly, claims 7-9 and 11 are now in allowable condition because claims 7, 8 and 11 have been rewritten in independent form.

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the application as amended is in condition for allowance. Notice of such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application into better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any deficiency in fees, or credit any overpayment thereof, to the account of Blank Rome, LLP, Deposit Account No. 23-2185 (116511-00125). In the event that a Petition for Extension of Time is required to render the present Amendment timely and either does not accompany the present Amendment or does not suffice to render the present Amendment timely, the Applicant respectfully petitions under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render the present Amendment timely. Any fee due is authorized above.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David J. Edmondson
Reg. No. 35,126
Attorney for Applicant

Blank Rome LLP
Watergate
600 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20037-2485
Telephone 202-772-5800
Facsimile 202-572-8398